

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

ddress:	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	DAMAN DERIC GOV

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,822	11/04/2003	Masaru Furuta	NOG-0019	4442
23353 . 75	590 05/13/2004		EXAMINER	
RADER FISH	IMAN & GRAUER P NG	LLC	WELLS,	NIKITA
	REET N.W., SUITE 501		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20036		2881	1.
			DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
•	10/699,822	FURUTA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Nikita Wells	2881					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ars on the cover sh et with the co	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 No	ovember 2003.						
	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	,						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
	9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 04 November 2003 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o		•					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		+					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	· 7	d in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau	, ,,,						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)	∧ □	(DTÔ 440)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>050504</u> .		atent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 2881

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-6 and 8-10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by R.M. Caprioli (5,808,300).

With respect to claims 1, 2, 5, and 9, R.M. Caprioli discloses (Fig. 29; Col. 2, lines 55-64; Col. 3, lines 24-42; and Col 8, lines 45-62) a sample preparation method and apparatus for sample analysis of samples on sample plates by matrix assisted laser desorption ionization (MALDI) mass spectrometry comprising: method which applies a laser beam onto the sample placed on the sample plate (22) attached to a mass spectrometer (10) so that the sample is ionized, the sample plate (22) having one portion of areas on the sample plate (22) surface as an ionization area used for ionizing the sample through laser irradiation, and another portion on the sample plate surface being prepared as a plane area to which a membrane bearing the sample adsorbed thereon is fixed.

With respect to claims 4, 6, 8, and 10, R.M. Caprioli discloses a sample preparation method and apparatus for sample analysis of samples on sample plates by (MALDI) mass spectrometry wherein the sample on the membrane consists of peptides, proteins, lipids, saccharides, or the membrane is at least one polymer selected from the group consisting of PVDF, nylon, or cellulose (see Col. 1, lines 8-14 and lines 51-67).

Art Unit: 2881

With respect to claim 3, R.M. Caprioli discloses (Col. 10, lines 44-48 and 61-67) the sample preparation method, wherein in the step of fixedly holding the membrane bearing the sample adsorbed to the plane area, a medium in which the sample is developed is superposed on the membrane so that, after the sample has been transferred from the medium to the membrane by applying a voltage between the medium and membrane, the membrane is fixedly held in a state in which the membrane is electrically conducted to the sample plate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 7, 11, and 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over R.M. Caprioli (5,808,300) in view of Brown et al. (2003/0116707).

With respect to claims 11 and 12, R.M. Caprioli discloses a sample preparation method and apparatus for sample analysis of samples on sample plates by (MALDI) mass spectrometry, but fails to disclose that the ionization area, portions on which respective samples are separated from the other portions by borders having grooves each of which surrounds the corresponding sample.

However, Brown et al. disclose (Abstract; Fig. 1, 0004; and claims 1, 10, 17, and 41) a MALDI mass spectrometer sample plate having portions on which respective samples are placed which are separated from the other portions by borders having grooves.

Art Unit: 2881

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize and substitute the MALDI sample plate of Brown et al. into the MALDI mass spectrometry apparatus of R.M. Caprioli to provide samples with borders having appropriate grooves in order to facilitate the analysis of peptides, proteins, lipids, saccharides, etc.

With respect to claim 7, Brown et al. fail to disclose that in the sample preparation method, the modifying reaction is a reaction caused by at least one enzyme selected from the group consisting of proteolytic enzyme, glycolytic enzyme, nuclease and a combination thereof. However, the treatment with enzymes is a normal way of fragmenting the proteins, wherein the resulting fragments are further subjected to high accuracy MALDI mass analysis.

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gusev et al. (6,140,639) disclose a system and method for on-line coupling of liquid capillary separation with MALDI mass spectroscopic analysis of peptides, proteins, lipids, saccharides, and polymers.
- 6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2881

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nikita Wells whose telephone number is (571) 272-2484. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2477. The central fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Nikita Wells

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2881

May 5, 2004